ORIGIN POINTS, ARCHEOLOGY, AND THE SEARCH FOR AUTHENTICITY

Lying down on her back with her left shoulder towards the viewer, the subject of Diego Rivera's *Venus de Milo* of 1903 **(Cat. no X1)** seems to be taking a well-deserved break from centuries of standing in her sensuous contrapposto. It requires a second look to recognize the *Venus* of Rivera's copy for her iconic facial features—her aquiline nose, her almond-shaped eyes, and her seductive smile—are obscured by the angle at which she is rendered. Rivera also obscures her famous stance and curving hips, which barely hold up the drapery falling precipitously down her legs—taunting a moment of revelation that never comes. Rivera's drawn "Venus," however, looks as if she might not even posses a right leg, as her body is compressed by dramatic foreshortening. Features furthest from the viewer are drawn in with a lighter penciled touch, dutifully aiding in the recession of the figure towards the back of the picture plane; the hair, the element closest to us, is more meticulously defined—in wavy, grouped strands. Rivera's emphasis on her capillary corrugations highlights the artist's interest in rendering traditionally unheralded aspects of the statue visible. The curve and muscular strength of her graceful back, the clover-like nature of the deformation of the severance at her left shoulder, the brilliance and depth of the drillwork defining her falling drapery and the change in the sensation of tactility from the flesh that the fabric represents for the viewer are prominently featured in the drawing.

Pablo Picasso's youthful rendering of the *Venus de Milo* **(Cat. no X2),** one of a series of several undertaken from 1895 to 1896, represents the subject from a traditional standing three-quarter viewpoint.[1] Yet this rendering is not necessarily less innovative than Rivera's for it, emphasizing the top half of the body and only notationally drawing in the drapery folds. As in Rivera's image, there is a strength and power to Picasso's "Venus" that dominates his rendering. Due to the rigorousness of Picasso's shading technique, this strength is very different to the constructs of sensuality and sexuality that usually characterize the figure.[2] The "Venus's" lips are almost obscured by the ferocity of their shading and by the prominent outline of the chin, jaw and neck below it. The flesh of the Venus's stomach presents itself not as softly feminine, but muscularly developed, shaded as if it were a series of so many sculpted and intersected planes in a manner similar to Picasso's earlier treatment of the abdominal muscles of the *Torso Belvedere* **(Cat. no. X3).** The pronounced shading and active musculature delineated in these drawings

reveal an eagerness on the part of the artists to show their mastery of perceiving and then rendering depth in a two-dimensional format. This keen understanding of sculptural depth and its translation to the canvas, as well as an attention to the materiality of the subject translated, would paradoxically aid them both in developing their own avant-garde styles.

The *Venus de Milo*s from which Rivera and Picasso copied were doubtless plaster casts, most likely reductions, as was common in contemporary art academies. The reduction could be read pictorially through the large amounts of space in the picture plane surrounding the "Venuses," making them look smaller. The Rivera drawing implies an easy manipulation of the object depicted: forced to lie on its back in a manner unnatural to it and at eye level to the artist. Both of these early drawings, in other words, define sculpture against its grain: as objects to be manipulated and de-naturalized, emphasized only in part as could serve the artist. The academic heresy of using statues against their emblematic characteristics of obdurate materiality and immovability is only compounded— worsened—by the origins of these statues in the mythologized and universalized Greco-Roman artistic cannon. Canonical works like the *Venus de Milo* or the *Torso Belvedere* were deferred to in academies as the best examples of the imitation of nature in art; to emulate them was therefore to drink at the source of art and became a *de riguer* student exercise.[3] Rivera's and Picasso's student drawings, however, suggest a malleability to Classical Art—both its artifacts and its canon— that the objects were never meant to embody. They reveal a willingness on the part of the authors not only to gain information from, but to play with and render anew, forms handed down through tradition.

Both Pablo Picasso and Diego Rivera precociously began their careers in art academies, institutions where rigorous copying of the Antique and ruthless adhesion to the principles it encapsulated was the chief means to a successful career. One such principle was that of its universality: the ability of Greek sculpture to meld with the Roman copies of it into a collective Classical entity that stood for the origin (and high) point of all culture in the civilized world.[4] In academic terms, these sculptures formed the building block of an artists' repertoire. They were the subjects from which he ought to draw his inspiration, citing them either in part or in whole in the creation of the new works. The artist's citational ability arose through extensive training based on the copying of such forms in engravings, then in plaster casts, at his Academy.[5] A typical example of such citation and recombination can be found in the youthful work of Jean-Auguste Dominique Ingres, an artist greatly admired both by Rivera and Picasso.[6] His

Ambassadors of Agamemnon (1801) (**Fig. 1),** cites two Antique sculptures in full—done from memory as he was not allowed to consult outside images: *Phocion*, copied in the character of Ulysses, and an *Apollo Sauroctonos*, whose form inspired that of Achilles's friend Patroclus **(Figures 2 and 3)**.[7] A reliance upon a lauded canon that revered sculptures from the past, appropriated by civilized men as the origin point of their culture, was therefore drummed into Rivera and Picasso at a young age; yet at the end of their youthful academic careers, as demonstrated by both *Venus* drawings, they were each already exhibiting tendencies to undermine such a canon—if not the academic apparatus that brought them to it. It was simply a question, for both men, of re-locating the origin points of their own art in that of a culture that had greater meaning to them: Ancient Iberian art for Picasso and Ancient Mexican art for Rivera.

The abandonment of an adherence to a universalized Greco-Roman past for a more nationally relevant—if ultimately generalized—past occurred for each artists at different times in their careers. Though the ambition to paint nationalistically can be reliably dated to the *Zapatista Landscape* **(Cat. No. X4)** of Rivera's Cubist period, Diego Rivera's memoirs would have the reader believe it dates to his early Mexican landscapes of 1904 to1907.[8] Scholar David Craven argues that much in of the content of these early landscapes (including *La Era,* **Cat. No. X5)** –his depictions of a Pre-Columbian archeological site, the location of the execution of the Emperor Maximillian, the characteristic flora and fauna of Mexico as well as the legendary volcano Popocatepetl—reveals a willingness to adopt an avant-garde style (impressionism) to local subject matter. Quintessentially Mexican details of landscape and dress come to the fore in the much later *Zapatista Landscape* of 1815 **(Cat. No. X4),** concocted in Paris after Rivera's initial trip to Spain. One can make out a mountainous region (perhaps the Valley of Mexico) as well as desert shrubbery, presided over by a sombrero, rifle and a woven *serape* (shawl). The use of traditionally Mexican objects that were newly mobilized as symbols for the political left in the Mexican Revolution of 1910 departs from the vocabulary of wineglasses, bottles, and pipes typical of Cubism: everyday items characteristic of the way the Cubists lived.[9] Rivera's change in visual rhetoric would lead the artist to declare that the Cubists ultimately decried his work as too "exotic."[10]

Rivera's *Zapatista Landscape* marked a brief return to representing the politics and symbols of Mexico in a career that had been otherwise devoted to mastering European academicism and modernism. Only when Rivera returned to Mexico in 1921 did he begin to

meaningfully incorporate Ancient Native Mexican themes and sculptures in his painted works. That Picasso's discovery of his "Native" Antique occurred before his Cubist phase and Rivera's afterwards should not preclude us from comparing the two; both discoveries happened after each artist had moved to Paris and had experienced life in avant-garde circles, away from the traditional pressures of the academies they were formed in. Both were triggered by a new experience of archeological artifacts from and return visits to the artist's homeland; for Picasso, Iberian artifacts in the Louvre and a visit to Gósol in Spain in the summer of 1806; for Rivera, the Mayan ruins of Chichén Itzá and Uxmal in the Yucatan peninsula, seen just after the artist's return to Mexico in 1921 and a visit to the city of Tehuantepec a year later.[11]

Thanks to the interests of a curator in the Louvre and two dedicated archeologists, Pierre Paris and Arthur Engel, works from excavations undertaken in the late nineteenth-century at ancient sites throughout southern and western Spain were incorporated into and displayed with the Louvre's collection of Ancient Cypriot and Rhodesian art by 1901.[12] As such, the Iberian works garnered further attention from their associations with sources of indisputable pedigree.[13] This association placed the Iberian works in the line of antiquity that academic artists were encouraged to copy, but provided an alternate authority upon which to base an origin myth: a myth that was more specific, if still broadly universalized, to Picasso's own background. We know from the writings of Ardegno Soffici, an Italian writer, artist, and critic who was living in Paris at the time, that Picasso went frequently to the Antiquities sections in the Louvre.[14] While we do not know which specific artworks he was drawn to on the spot, we have a good idea of what he might have seen and what he later purchased.

By 1904, the Louvre had acquired enough of a collection from diverse find sites in Spain to devote an entire room of the "Antiquités Orientales" wing to the these statuettes.[15] The archaic Iberian stone heads that Picasso legendarily acquired from the Louvre after Appollinaire's friend Gery Pieret stole them in March of 1907—one, a head of a man and the other, the head of a woman—came from the find at the site of Cerro de los Santos (Albacete), itself one of the earliest sites to interest French archeologists **(Figures 4 & 5)**.[16] The *Man Attacked by a Lion,* **(Cat. No. X6)** that the scholar James Johnson Sweeney first linked with Picasso's 1906 *Self-Portrait* **(Cat. No. X7)** due to its particular aesthetics and timely display in the Louvre in 1906, was found at Osuna, in Andalucía not far from Picasso's birthplace of Malaga). [17] Its current

location in Madrid is deceptive; it was repatriated from Paris in the early years of World War II.[18]

Pieret's theft of Iberian artifacts from the Louvre is often connected with Picasso's work at Gósol, though it should be noted that during the summer of 1906, Picasso had not yet acquired the Louvre's statuettes and therefore would have carried with him only the memory of them amidst a great group of Iberian Antiquities. What must have struck him was the overall depth, strong recession, and absolute precision of the carved lines making up the facial features of these statues. If we look at the *Head of a Man* or *Head of a Woman* from Cerro de los Santos (3rd century BC) that Pieret would eventually steal for Picasso, we note the prominent long noses, the cavities out of which the precise lines for the eyes are hollowed, and the depth of the cutting or drill-work of the line that separates the full-bodied lips. The emphasis on line in these statuettes translates readily to a two-dimensional rendering, provided that the thickness of the painted line can be made to signify the depth of the sculptural cut in two dimensions. Like the *Venus de Milo*, these Iberian heads would be manipulated to serve Picasso's aesthetic purposes. It is not surprising that scholar Werner Spies describes Picasso's aesthetic experiments in Gósol as "virtual sculpture;" the artist's Gósol works retained all carved Iberian suggestions of sculptural depth in painted form.[19]

Robert Rosenblum has noted that "for Picasso, the Gósol summer [of 1906]… prompted many kinds of regression to ethnic and primitive roots, the Spanish equivalent, we might say, of Gauguin's and Bernard's sojourns in Pont-Aven."[20] Looking to one's origins to find an authentic version of the past, as Picasso did with Pre-Roman Spain and Gauguin with Brittany, as opposed to appropriating it from a culture with which the artist had no connection, as Picasso would do with pre-colonial Africa and Gauguin with Tahiti, seems for these artists to have been a vital step from accepting and repeating Classical academic references to adopting a new aesthetic vocabulary.

The earliest works marking Picasso's engagement with Iberian sculpture lend it a cut-and paste aesthetic: the addition of the Iberian heads to more academically styled bodies in *Woman with Loaves*, *Nude Reclining*, and *Head of a Woman* (Fernande) (all 1906) and later, the portrait of Gertrude Stein **(Figures 6, 7, 8, and 9).** Both the subject of the *Woman with Loaves* and Fernande in *Reclining Nude* have long regular noses as symmetrically defining features of their faces—it shapes the sculptural dynamic of the eyes and the lips. This is true of the Iberian heads

Picasso had seen in the Louvre, (and would eventually acquire upon his return to Paris), where the nose practically exists to be able to set off the eyes, which are in turn dug deeply away from its bridge. The wide and deep carve of the curved eyebrows of the statuettes accentuates their work of highlighting the eyes, as the carving stroke delineating the lips from one another accentuates their fullness. These features appear nearly as sculptural in the paintings and drawings of the Gósol women. Each of these heads, it is always noted, seem disjointed from its body.[21] The face of *Woman with Loaves* is aggressively outlined inside the white head-covering painted around it and seems deeply recessed into it, mimicking the qualities of a sculpted head.

In both *Woman with Loaves* and *Nude Reclining*, however, Picasso also provides us with elements which mitigate the cut-and-paste aesthetic: for the *Woman with Loaves*, it is the universal intensity of hue, in particular the golden-brown, carefully shaded splendor of the skin. The historically specific "primitive" face—a face that existed before the canonization of the Greco-Roman face—is attached to the timelessly "primitive" of the female body.[22] That primitive female body is also now assigned a cultural specificity: traditional Catalonian. Not only does the reclining image of Fernande resemble Goya's *Naked Maja* of 1805, it also recalls a painting of Fernande, dressed in a Spanish *mantilla* and wearing the voluminous skirts also common of the region, seated on the back of a local mule while the Pedraforca mountain range outside Gósol rises in the background behind her **(Fig. 10).** [23] The level of immersion in traditional Catalonian culture the painting represents in one who is typically at the cutting edge of the avant-garde could be likened to Rivera's sentimental nationalism painted into his Cubist *Zapatista Landscape*. Picasso, however, takes his lover, not political patriotism, as his subject matter, primitiviszing and falsely nationalizing Fernande by assigning to her a culture he is exploring as a potential origin point for his art. Rivera's first painting of Kahlo, who herself frequently chose to dress in various traditional Mexican clothing styles to represent her nationalist pride, was of a worker in *Distribution of Weapons*, part of the *Apotheosis of the Mexican Revolution* cycle painted in 1928 **(Fig. 11).**[24] Frida represents a lethal and powerful instrument of modernity and progress, not a quaint link to the past—her face is her own, and her dress, red shirt included, is resolutely contemporary, western-styled, and politically meaningful.

It is not just women Picasso painted in this primitivising Iberian style in Gósol; he eventually submitted himself to a similar treatment, ultimately adopting the identity with an older, more culturally specific Antique he had proposed for Fernande. A self-portrait, probably

begun in the summer in Gósol and finished in the fall of that year, adapts the same long nose, carefully delineated lips, and deeply set eyes from Iberian sculptures (**Cat. X7).** [25] The eyebrows, completed in what seems like a single, arching stroke, and the "primitivized" facial features support this interpretation.[26] To counter the flatness of the universality of the skin tone, Picasso adds obvious strokes of greyed shading to the sides of the face and to the collarbone area, almost in a parody of his technical academic training. The crude shading also appear on the area of the neck furthest away from the boldly outlined chin and in the area distinguishing Picasso's right eye from his nose. This painting, which has a sort of unfinished quality to the bottom half of the torso, nevertheless presents a body more uniformly rendered than Fernande's in *Nude Reclining* in that the head seems to match up much better stylistically with the body upon which it has been set. Wide swaths of pink skin contrast with sharp black outlines, from which the artist builds up grey paint to signify volume in the plane of the flesh; similar volume-creating tactics delineate his cheeks and chin. Picasso's experiments with placing Iberian-styled heads upon bodies not stylistically consistent with them come to a resolution here, in his own self-image. Academically informed, sculpturally realized, and self-aggrandizing in his choice of Hispanicizing reference point, Picasso's 1906 *Self-Portrait* opens up bodily possibilities of a holistically conceived primitivizing style, which visits to the Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadero would further condense for the artist into an African and Polynesian Primitivist style. [27]

Despite the fact that we have no self-portraits of Rivera that bear an outright resemblance to the many works of Mexican Pre-Conquest art that he collected, his work beginning in 1921 citing these types of objects was as deeply imbedded in his identity of selfhood as were Picasso's paintings citing Ancient Iberian art, if not more so. Rivera returned to Mexico in 1921 from Paris and Cubism – which had been followed by a brief flirtation with an Ingres-ian classicism and a trip to Italy sponsored by his own government to study the art of the fresco — to a Mexico run by the greatest general of the 1810 Mexican Revolution, Alvaro Obregon, and a cultural sphere presided over by his dynamic young Minister of Education, José Vasconcelos.[28] Vasconcelos had developed a vast program of social and cultural modernization that included integrating Mexico's multi-ethnic population into a cohesive society, drastically increasing literacy rates across the nation, promoting the history of Pre-Conquest Mexico and revitalizing

the visual and performing arts; the minister's mural-painting scheme for the walls of prominent public buildings, begun in 1921, aimed to address parts of this program.[29] Before he gave Rivera his first mural commission, Vasconcelos had the artist accompany him on a government-sponsored trip to the Yucatan Peninsula in November of 1921 along with other artists. This trip, and another journey, a year later, to Tehuantepec, proved to be Gósol-like experiences for Rivera. Like Picasso, Rivera voraciously consumed the landscapes, peoples, and artistic traditions of his new surroundings; the jungles of the Tehuantepec isthmus were integrated into the Anfitheatro Bolivar fresco (his first mural commission, 1922-1923) and the woman of the region wearing their characteristic clothing appear on the earliest frescos at the Ministry of Public Education in Mexico City (1923-1924) **(Figure 12).**

On the Yucatan trip, the artist visited the ruins of Chichen Itza and Uxmal, recording both images from the sites and depictions of the local people in his sketchbooks. [30] Whether or not he began collecting Pre-Conquest art as a result of his contact with the Mayan ruins is uncelar; his first explicit integration of Pre-Conquest sculpture into his murals occurs with the kneeling women in the foreground of the *Day of the Dead* murals, including *First Friday of Sorrow on the Canal of Santa Anita* in the Court of the Fiestas at the Ministry of Public Education (1923-24) **(Figure 13).** Also present in the foreground of canvas works of the 1920s, such as *Flower Festival* **(Figure 14),** these kneeling women with their backs to the viewer and their attention focused in on the scene before them stand in for the viewing experience of the beholder at the same time as they enact it. Inspired by the basalt kneeling sculptural figures from the Aztec Civilization, such as *Chalchihuitlicue*s or other fertility goddesses **(Cat. No. X8),** these painted women reflect Rivera's treatment of sculpture first evident in his early manipulation of the *Venus de Milo*.[31] Firstly, the subjects are women; next, the sculptures were created in an era the artist was either encouraged to view or legitimately viewed as an origin point of (his) civilization; third, the subjects are manipulated with an ease suggesting their smallish size (the *Chalchihuitlices* in the Rivera Collection are around a foot high each).[32]

Nearly all photographs of these Aztec *Chalchihuitlicue*s that appear in scholarly works highlighting their archeological significance show the statues from the front, whereas books focusing on Rivera's use of them show both the front and back, as the latter was of greater interest to the artist. He carefully noted the details of their hair arrangements (most often braids) and their bare feet, folded beneath them, which makes them easy to spot as a leitmotif in his

work. In 1920s images, the viewer does not often have access to their painted facial expressions, which might individuate them, but merely their calm-miened silhouette. The material quality of basalt, a hardened volcanic stone that is similarly difficult as granite to carve—is reflected in the compact nature and relatively linear carving of the statues. Like Picasso with his Iberian heads, Rivera exploited the qualities of his source material, using bold black outline for the toes and arms of the figures and color-blocked white shirts and dark skirts—one shirt even following the downward-pointed shawl line of a *Chalchihuitlicue*— in *Flower Festival*. Rivera's kneeling women appear rectangularly solid, like the block of stone from which the *Chalchihuitlicue* figures were hewn. The painted women's anchoring of Rivera's image and their simultaneously demure, submissive nature encourages the viewer to primitivize them, even as we identify with them.

Scholars Patricia Leighton and Mark Antliff note that the primitive as it was practiced in late nineteenth and early twentieth century art was composed of four elements: a regression in time or space from the modern, civilized world; the use of "native" non-white racial types to signify pre-civilized states; the projection of simplistic thought and activity onto the lower, often rural, classes; and finally, the use of the female body to stand in for the most primal, or natural, of beings due in part to her reproductive capacities.[33] Rivera's kneeling women are nearly always rendered as mestizos or natives in terms of their skin color—in this way, and in their massing groundedness and femininity, Rivera projects onto these women a mythical origin point for Mexican art that he nevertheless controls through his appropriation of their forms.

Rivera would depict these kneeling women in his paintings for the rest of his life. Only once does the artist take over their position of contemplating the scene in front of them—like Picasso before him, he adapts the primitivizing motif he had projected onto contemporary women in his painting for himself once it had become his signature. He appropriates their actions, if not too overly their style, in his mural *The Making of a Fresco* in the San Francisco Art Institute (1931). Here, Rivera himself sits at the center of his scaffolding, back to the viewer, watching others labor over a mural depicting labor **(Figure 15).** Whereas Picasso built a career on shifting identities—from Spanish to French, from Cubist to Classical, from Iberian to African and Polynesian Antique reference points—Rivera built his career upon his identity as a proud Mexican nationalist. Over time, Rivera's work would progress from general expressions of the nationalism—the *Tehuanas* of the early panels of the fresco cycle of the Ministry of Public

Education and the *Dance at Tehuantepec* **(Cat. no. X9)—**to using specific imagery grounded in Mexico's Antique past, a past he took upon himself not only to collect—and so to preserve—but also to adapt to the activities of modern Mexicans.

At the same time as Rivera was turning *Chalchihuitlicue*s into kneeling *Tehuanas*, he was also sketching native "Indians" – possibly in the Yucatan or in Tehuantepec-- whose faces would become informed by death masks from the ancient city of Teotihuacan **(Cat. no. X10 and X11).** Though the site had caught the attention of foreign explorers as early as 1675, Teotihuacan began to be fully exploited by local archaeologists only beginning in 1905.[34] The site's first Mexican Chief Excavator, Leopoldo Borras, was charged with the excavation of the Pyramid of the Sun by then-president Porfirio Diaz (who also sponsored Rivera's trip to Europe) to have it ready for foreign luminaries to visit on the centennial of Mexican independence in 1910.[35] Work undertaken after the 1910 Revolution was further encouraged as a nationalistic celebration of the glorious past of Mexico and its indigenous people.[36] Rivera would celebrate these same ethnic groups upon his return to Mexico in 1921, by which point, the excavations at Teotihuacan had only become more sophisticated and widespread.[37] Results of newer excavations were published beginning in 1922; it is possible that Rivera not only read these publications but went to the area himself, given its proximity to Mexico City and his interests in Pre-Columbian art.

Rivera ended up amassing many of these masks in his collection; they are the archeological object most associated with Teotihuacan as so many have been found there (**Cat. no. X12 and X 13).**[38] The drawings from his early sketchbooks show that he must have come in contact with these masks at an early stage in his career. Like the basalt Aztec *Chalchihuitlicue* figures, these masks were carved with an eye to line, which allowed Rivera to capture their essence with carefully sketched two-dimensional outlines. The faces are broad, with a large nose and wide-set almond shaped eyes. The indented features (dimples) of the cheeks and the heavy-set jaw, not to mention the deep relief of the parted lips, were replicated by Rivera in his drawing of a mask, complete with the ears sticking out prominently from the face (**Cat. No. X10).** His contemporary drawing adapts those features—the prominent nose, the almond eyes and the full lips—to the person of a native woman **(Cat. No. X11).**

Rivera again drew on these death masks in a series of pastels in 1938 to help shape the faces of native women selling flowers **(Figures 16, 17, 18).** Their bodies obscured by the flowers they sell, the women stand against massive dark stone walls of the kind that would later

define the museum at Anahuacalli, itself a blend of Toltec and Mayan architectural styles. [39] This primitivizing naturalization of contemporary native Mexican woman with Mexico's historical past through the citation of a distinctive facial type endemic to Teotihuacan death masks is superficially similar to Picasso's appropriation of Ancient Iberian heads. Picasso's interest in Iberian art was academically and personally informed but ultimately more useful to him as a style to be tried on and tried out and then cast aside when no longer useful. Rivera's use of Ancient Mexican art infiltrated his style to the point that the two cannot always be torn asunder. Rivera so strongly identified the particular facial style embodied in the death masks of Teotihuacan with the native peoples of the Americas that he replicated it seemingly automatically. When making his murals in the Detroit Industry for the Arts in 1932, no doubt in the absence of Teotihuacan art, Rivera used the facial type of the death mask to inform (and differentiate from the other races) the "Red Race," or native Indian, figure **(Figure 19).**

Rivera would replicate the Teotihuacan faces over and over again in his work; like the kneelers, they are present throughout his corpus, in mural cycles as diverse as those at the Palacio Nacional (1929-30) and the Palace of Cortez (1930) and those representing *Pan American Unity* (1940) and *Dream of a Sunday Afternoon in the Alameda* (1947-48). Like the works of Classical art he began his career copying, these figures became building blocks for art—and on them, Rivera constructed a pedagogically and politically oriented mural painting that was primitivizing, but nevertheless for him, profoundly Mexican not just in content but also in form.

That form, however, was somewhat generalized and universalized; the diversity and arrangement of his collection at Anahuacalli makes that clear. Over the course of his lifetime, Rivera had amassed an important number of stone sculptures, bas-relief fragments, baked clay figurines, temple models, and ceramic pottery from many different indigenous Mexican civilizations. The Aztec and later Teotihuacan Cultures (15th-16th century AD) were well represented, as was earlier art from Colima (1st century AD) and Tlatilco in the Valley of Mexico (5th Century BC).[40] The geographically, historically, and materially diverse collection also includes Oaxacan objects from the Zapotec and Mixtec Cultures (**for pieces from Rivera's Collection, now in the Anahuacalli Museum, see Cat Nos X----).[41] [Note to editor—if these loans go through, please include appropriate figure numbers here--- if not, please skip]**. Yet, in an "Altar" space he built into the museum to showcase different works in the collection,

art work from the Teotihuacan, Aztec, and Toltec Cultures are placed side by side, encouraging the viewer to see the work of each discrete civilization as a collective, generalizable whole.[42]

As Picasso elided Iberian cultures with African and Polynesian ones to engender the *Demoiselles d'Avignon*, so too are Rivera's Mexican-themed works in the 1920s and 1930s a result of using specific cultural references in the service of a the general; the indigenous women kneel in his canvases as Aztec *Chalchihuitlicue*s but face the viewer with facial features borrowed from Pre-Conquest Teotihuacan.[43] Ultimately, this generalization is in line with Rivera's life-long political goal of promoting the Mexican people and their art, exposing them to it in the imagery of themselves he provided in his pedagogically oriented murals placed in public spaces. Picasso's synthesis of Iberian art with his person (the 1906 *Self-Portrait*) is imperfect; its clear stylization sends the scholar hunting for its sources. Rivera's synthesis of Mexican art with himself, however is endlessly circular, seamless; by the time he assumed the painted position of his *Chalchihuitlicue* kneelers on the scaffold at the San Francisco Museum of the Arts, he was citing his own earlier transformations of these ancient forms. Picasso's multiple and varied citations represent, in his pre-Cubist years, a struggle to distance himself from an anchored past; Rivera's post-1922 work is always already performing Mexico's past— and his own history with it.

---

[1] Picasso's drawings from this 1895-1896 series all represent the *Venus de Milo* from nearly the same viewpoint, with varying degrees of finish. For all of the reproductions in the series, see **Staller 2001,** 105.
[2] **Haskell & Penny, 1981,** 328-330.
[3] For more on the canonical nature of these Greco-Roman statues, see **Haskell & Penny, 1981** 93-107**.** For a standard description of the Academic process as it had crystalized by the mid-nineteenth century in France, see **Boime 1986.**
[4] Winckelmann is considered to have been the first art historian to codify this academic trend, writing what many would call the first history of art, finished in the 1760s, in which Greek art was supreme over all other arts (due to climatic determinism) Once Greek art's supremacy had been secured, supplemented by the work of Hegel and other philosophers, Greek (and Roman, to the extent that Roman art was copied from Greek art) became the criteria for the biological, cultural, and mental best in the modern world. A society's level of civilization was, for much of the eighteenth through early twentieth centuries, based on the ways in which it measured up to this Greco-Roman ideal. **Araeen 1991,** 140. See also Chapter 9, "Winckelmann Divided" in **Davis 1996.**
[5] For more on the academic process as Picasso and Rivera experienced it, see **Craven 1997,** 10-15 and **New York 2011,** 2-7.
[6] One of Rivera's teachers at the Academy of San Carlos, Santiago Rebull, had been a student of Ingres. From Rebull, Rivera learned "…not only the rudiments of draughtsmanship but also about the 'golden section' as a compositional device" (**Craven 1997**, 12). In the years shortly following their Cubist

periods (c. 1816-1819), both Rivera and Picasso would produce several drawings in the style of Ingres (Luis-Martin Lozano, "Diego Rivera, Classicus Sum" in **Mexico City 1999,** 132-137). For more on Picasso's life-long relationship with Ingres's work, see Chapter 2, "Picasso and the French Tradition: Variations from 1903-1919" in **Galassi 1996**

[7] **Montauban 2006,** 296 -297.

[8] See Craven 14-19 and March, *Diego Rivera*, 24.

[9] For more on the Zapatista Landscape, see Cubist Heresies in Diego Rivera: art and Revoution, 118. For a travellor's account of trips to Tehuantepec, see Miguel Covarrubias, Mexico South, The Isthmus of Tehuantepec. New York: Knoph, 1947. See also Marta Turok " Frieda's attire: eclectic and Ethnic in Self Portrait in a Velvet Dress: Frida's Wardrobe esp. pages 51-59 (the whole article is 51-174)

[10] **Craven 1997**, 34-35 and **Rivera and March, 1960**, 65.

[11] For more details on the Yucatan and Tehuantepec visits, see **Detroit 1996,** 53. For details about Tehuantepec as a mythological point of origin for avant-garde Mexicans in the early twentieth century, see **Washington DC 1993**.

[12] The *terminus ante quem* for the incorporation of the finds from Cerro de los Santos, the first group of Iberian reliefs to be systematically acquired by the Louvre, is 1897 **(Rouillard 1997,** 11). By 1901, finds from Elche and Redovan had been catalogued as well. For more on the history and exhibitions of the Louvre's Antique Iberian collections, see **Rouillard 1997**, 5-16.

[13] For a description of the location of the Iberian works in the early twentieth century, see **Soffici 1942,** 365-366. See also **Washington DC 1997**, 49 and **Richardson 1994**, 21-23. Richardson describes the layout of the Phoenician Rooms, using the description of Géry Pieret from *Paris- Journal* of August 29, 1911 in his description.

[14] See **Soffici 1942**, 365-366.

[15] **Rouillard 1997,** 15.

[16] For more on the theft, see **Rouillard 1997**, 15-16 and **Richardson 2006**, Volume 2, 21-24.

[17] McCully discusses this link in "Eating Fire" in **McCully 2011,** 195. For Sweeney's link between the works, see **Sweeney 1941,** 192-193. Thanks to Lilly Casillas for her research on this link and on the repatriation of Osuna statuary to Spain in 1941.

[18] **Rouillard 1997**, 7. See **Garcia y Bellido 1943,** 11-12 for the repatriation process.

[19] **Spies 1983**, 321, note 41. See also **Stepan 2006**, 28.

[20] Robert Rosenblum, "Picasso in Gósol: The Calm before the Storm," in **Washington D.C 1997**, 268.

[21] Sweeney 1941 is one of the earliest sources to note this disjuncture.

[22] For an artful exploration of the ways in which the feminine body was perceived to be closer to nature in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than the masculine one—and therefore, further from culture and civil society—see **Antliff and Leighten 1996**, 220-225.

[23] Rosenblum in **Washington DC 1997,** 267. See also **New York 2011**, 128.

[24] For more on Frida Kahlo's dress styling, **Rosenzweig & Rosenzweig 2008,** 52. For more on the Nationalistic dress of women in Mexico in the early twentieth century, see the "Epilogue" in **Zavala, 2010.**

[25] For more on this Self-Portrait's "mask-like" aesthetic, see **Stepan 2006,** 28-29 (Stepan, mistakenly, in my view, refers to the image as borrowing its expression from a *kouros)*.

[26] An unpublished conversation between Zervos and Picasso **(**documented and excerpted in **Sweeney 1941**, 191, fn.1) has allowed Sweeney to link this self-representation's aesthetics specifically to the Ancient Iberian sculpture, *Man Attacked by Lion* (**Sweeney 1941**, 191) (Cat. no. X). I agree with Rubin's more general link of the work to the Iberian-influenced sculptural aesthetic which Picasso was developing at this time (**New York 1980**, 59). Thanks to Lilly Casillas for her hard work in tracking down this reference.

[27] **Foster 2004**, 29. See **Lemke 1998,** 33-36 for an excellent discussion of the exact role of Iberian and African "Primitive" sculpture in Picasso's art and Picasso's problematic relationship to admitting the importance of the African influence in his work. For the infamous description of Picasso's Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadero visit, see **Richardson 1994** 24-27.
[28] **Hamill 1999,** 73 and 81. For a chronology of Rivera's activity from his Cubist period in Paris to his return to Mexico in July of 1921, see Laurence P. Hurlburt "Diego Rivera (1886-1957): A Chronology of this Art, Life and Times" in **Detroit 1996**, 37-53.
[29] **Hamill 1999,** 81-84. **Detroit 1996**, 242.
[30] **Hamill 1999**, 84. Many of the sketchbooks in question are in private hands.
[31] For more on the history of these Chalchihuitlicue figures in the collection, see **Anahuacalli 1970,** 105. See also Head of a Water Deity [Mexico; Aztec]" (00.5.44) In *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000–. http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/00.5.44. (October 2006)
[32] Most of the statuary of the Anahuacalli collection is non-monumental. **Anahuacalli 1970,** 105.
[33] See **Antliff and Leighten 2003**.
[34] For a history of exploration of the site, both local and foreign, see Mari Carmen-Serra Puche, "The Role of Teotihuacan in Meso-American archaeology" in **San Francisco 1993,**
65-66.
[35] Puche in **San Francisco 1993,** 66.
[36] Puche in **San Francisco 1993,**67.
[37] Puche in **San Francisco 1993,** 67-68; this included interdisciplinary studies of the geography of the region, as well as an investigation into the Temple of the Serpent.
[38] For the ubiquity of these masks at the site and in Rivera's collection, see **Anahuacalli 1970,** 39.
[39] **Anahuacalli 1965**, 27.
[40] There is very little information available in the English language scholarship as to the exact time periods in which Rivera amassed the specific objects in his collection. He must have begun his collecting as Picasso did, relatively early on in his career— certainly of the clay figurines as as Lupe, his first wife, famously served them to him in a soup as they had nothing else to eat due to Rivera's profligate spending on ancient Mexican art **(Marnham 1998, 298).** His citation of a wide variety of Pre-Conquest Works throughout his post- 1921 oeuvre suggests that the process of acquisition was a life-long project. For a good description of the kind of work and the variety of cultures represented in the Anahuacalli Museum's collection, see **Anahuacalli 1965,** 27-28.
[41] **Anahuacalli 1965,** 27-28.
[42] **Anahuacalli 1970,** 26.
[43] Certainly, Rivera's later works, including murals for the Palazzo Nacional (1929-30) depicting the history of Mexico from the Fall of Teotihuacan in 900 AD to the beginning of 1935), do distinguish between Mayan, Toltec, and Aztec civilizations (**Detroit 1996,** 261).